

U.S. Appln. No. 10/019,135
Response to Office Action dated May 4, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 26 2006

PATENT
450119-03138

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 12 and 14, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically on pages 36-37. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,601,041 to Brown, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Brown") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,346 to Frid-Nielsen, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Frid-Nielsen") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,857 to Batten-Carew, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Batten-Carew").

U.S. Appln. No. 10/019,135
Response to Office Action dated May 4, 2006

PATENT
450119-03138

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Brown in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0047298 to Moore, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Moore") and further in view of Frid Nielsen and Batten-Carew.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"A service system for automatically distributing electronic information contents...comprising:

wherein when two or more display times overlap, the information provider adjusts a connection time zone to prevent overlap of two or more connection times; and

wherein said information processing apparatus is automatically activated at a startup time that is further counted back from the connection time and an automatic browsing application is initiated at said startup time."
(emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Brown relates to prioritized queues of advertising and content data which are generated by a queue builder and sent to an on-line queue manager. A computer mediated communications network provides content and subscriber data to the queue builder and receives content segment play lists from the on-line queue manager.

As understood by Applicants, Frid-Nielsen relates to a method for reconciling two sets of information on an information processing system. The method includes loading both sets of data, detecting the current date, building a new list for each set of data, synchronizing the lists (typically, according to time), and displaying the synchronized lists.

As understood by Applicants, Moore relates to providing metadata-selected advertisements. The systems and methods may receive metadata and other media, select an object, read metadata attached to or associated with the selected object, select an advertisement based on the metadata, and display the selected advertisement.

U.S. Appln. No. 10/019,135
Response to Office Action dated May 4, 2006

PATENT
450119-03138

As understood by Applicants, Batten-Carew relates to controlling release of time-sensitive information at a specific future time which only becomes active once the specific future time has passed. When the specific future time has passed, a server releases the access information such that an end-user or end-users may utilize the access information to obtain time-sensitive information. The access information may be a random number which can be used to calculate a decryption key and an encryption key.

Applicants submit that Brown, Moore, Frid-Nielson and Batten-Carew, taken either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 1. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion of a service system for automatically distributing electronic information contents wherein when two or more display times overlap, the information provider adjusts a connection time zone to prevent overlap of two or more connection times and said information processing apparatus is automatically activated at a startup time that is further counted back from the connection time and an automatic browsing application is initiated at said startup time, as recited in independent claim 1.

Furthermore, the Office Action relies on column 5, lines 9-39 of Frid-Nielson to teach or suggest that when two or more display times overlap, the information provider adjusts a connection time zone to prevent overlap of two or more connection times. However, column 5, lines 9-39 of Frid-Nielson merely discloses "transfer events from one list to another by selectively specifying the desired event and the direction of insertion. In a manner similar to that for reconciling scheduling information, the to-do lists of client areas may be reconciled, for example by synchronizing corresponding due dates."

U.S. Appln. No. 10/019,135
Response to Office Action dated May 4, 2006

PATENT
450119-03138

Applicants submit that reconciling two schedules by building synchronized lists does not teach or suggest that when two or more display times overlap, the information provider adjusts a connection time zone to prevent overlap of two or more connection times.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 6, 12 and 14 are also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 6, 12 and 14 are patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.


U.S. Appln. No. 10/019,135
Response to Office Action dated May 4, 2006

PATENT
450119-03138

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800